

REMARKS

The claims have not been amended. The drawings have been amended to correct certain informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 4, and 7 are independent claims. Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 4-6 are allowed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the drawings do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 2, lines 10-17, and at page 4, lines 16-21 of the specification.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Amendments to the Drawings

Attached hereto are replacement figure sheets for Figures 1A and 1B, which include the changes, without markings, identified below.

In Figure 1A, the title of the graph has been amended to recite "(WITH APPLYING IMAGE GAMMA)."

In Figure 1B, the title of the graph has been amended to recite "(WITHOUT APPLYING IMAGE GAMMA)."

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0190925 applied for by Awamoto, *et al.* ("Awamoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Applicant submits that Awamoto fails to disclose every feature of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

selecting a correction table from a memory according to the number of subfields and the automatic power control level.

Awamoto fails to disclose at least these features. The examiner asserts that Awamoto discloses these features at Awamoto's paragraph [0030]. Applicant disagrees. Awamoto is directed to a display panel that reduces "dynamic pseudo contours" when displaying a moving image. See Awamoto, paragraphs [0006], [0009]. To achieve this purpose, Awamoto's paragraph [0030] discloses two look-up table memories 811 and 812. As described in Awamoto's paragraph [0030], the selector 813 alternates between the two look-up table memories 811 and 812 by pixel and by row and along the boundary of two gradations to generate the "distribution of cells in the checked pattern," which is shown as Gradation 4 in Awamoto's Figure 10. Awamoto, paragraph [0030], lines 16-18. Thus, at best, Awamoto discloses selecting one of two look-up table memories 811 and 812 according to pixel and row.

Further, selecting one of two look-up table memories 811 and 812 according to pixel and row is unrelated to a number of subfields and an automatic power control level. First, as Awamoto discloses, an automatic power control is performed by the controller 71. However, as shown in Awamoto's Figure 2, the input to the selector 813 comes from the area decision portion 87, which evaluates relative gradations between pixels to determine a risk for dynamic pseudo contours. See Awamoto, paragraph [0031]. Thus, contrary to the examiner's assertion,

Awamoto fails to disclose that the selector 813 selects one of two look-up table memories 811 and 812 according to the automatic power control performed by the controller 71.

Second, Applicant disagrees with the examiner's reliance upon Awamoto's paragraph [0030], lines 1-12 to disclose "selecting a correction table from a memory according to the number of subfields." The gradations disclosed in lines 10-12 of paragraph [0030] refer to, for example, Gradation 3 and Gradation 5, which border the region of "dynamic pseudo contour" in Gradation 4 of Awamoto's Figure 10. As explained above, selecting one of two look-up table memories 811 and 812 alternately by pixel and by row along the boundary of Gradation 3 and Gradation 5 fails to disclose "selecting a correction table from a memory according to the number of subfields." Therefore, Awamoto fails to disclose at least "selecting a correction table from a memory according to the number of subfields and the automatic power control level" (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Awamoto as applied to claims 1-3 above, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058476 applied for by Kwon, *et al.* ("Kwon"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference

teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Assuming *arguendo* that the references may be combined and a reasonable expectation of success exists, the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

a controller for ... selecting a correction table corresponding to the number of subfields.

As in the rejection of claim 1, the examiner again relies upon Awamoto's paragraph [0030] to disclose these features of claim 7. Thus, for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that Awamoto, including paragraph [0030], fails to disclose at least these features of claim 7.

STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP

Moreover, Kwon is disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(c). Under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), "[s]ubject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more subsections of (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person."

In this case, Application No. 10/779,793 and Application No. 10/210,110 (Kwon) were, at the time the invention of this Application No. 10/779,793 was made, owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7. Claims 8-10 depend from claim 7 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 7, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 4-6 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: April 30, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/kbs